UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,094	12/18/2006	Michael E. Reck	55807.11 6929	
	71130 7590 08/06/2009 EXAMINER SEYFARTH SHAW LLP			
01122	DE CENTER EAST		FOX, JOHN C	
TWO SEAPORT LANE, SUITE 300 BOSTON, MA 02210-2028			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3753	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/06/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

bosippto@seyfarth.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/573,094	RECK, MICHAEL E.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	John Fox	3753					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Ju	ne 2009.						
· <u> </u>	action is non-final.						
·=	<i>'</i> —						
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,10,15 and 18</u> is/are pending in the	application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>18</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	_ ,						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,10 and 15</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers	·						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 June 2009</u> is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
	· · · · ·	-					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
	ammer. Note the attached Office	Action of formal a	0-132.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).					
•—	a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	ed in this National	Stage				
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
2) DNotice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	No(s)/Mail Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application					
. spor roto primari bato	5/ <u></u> .						

Art Unit: 3753

Claim 18 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse.

Page 2

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3, 10 and 15 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,655,412. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they differ merely by wording or the obvious use of a ball valve.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 3753

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnstone et al (US 3,770,016), of record.

Johnstone et al show a valve with a main flow path and a drain port 34 with a drain valve 32.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnstone et al.

The use of known pipe connections such as a union connector is considered an obvious matter of design choice over the valve of Johnstone et al.

Claims 1, 3, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piper, of record, in view of King (US 3,473,554), of record, and further in view of Isringhausen (US 5,623,300), of record.

Piper shows a three way valve with four seats and a drain line 60, but does not show a drain line ball valve. King shows a ball valve with a drain line 72 and a drain valve 74. Isringhausen shows a valve with a drain line having a ball valve. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made for one of ordinary skill in the art to

Application/Control Number: 10/573,094 Page 4

Art Unit: 3753

have used a ball valve in the drain line 60 of Piper in view of the teachings of King and Isringhausen to similarly provide flow control for the drain line.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Fox whose telephone number is 571-272-4912. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Saturday from 10am-6pm (Hoteling Program).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on 571-272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John Fox/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3753 Application/Control Number: 10/573,094

Page 5

Art Unit: 3753